

# City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning  
145 Gorman Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl  
Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

[PlanZone@annapolis.gov](mailto:PlanZone@annapolis.gov) • 410-260-2200 • Fax 410-263-9158 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • [www.annapolis.gov](http://www.annapolis.gov)

## Historic Preservation Commission VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING April 13, 2021

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public hearing as a virtual meeting on April 13, 2021. **Chair** Leahy called the meeting to order at 6:58pm.

**Commissioners Present:** **Chair** Leahy, **Vice Chair** Collins, Dr. Scott, Williams, Finch

**Staff Present:** R. Laynor- Chief, Historic Preservation, J. Tower, Assistant Chief, Historic Preservation, Joel Braithwaite-Assistant City Attorney, Jacqui Rouse

**Others Present:** Sheryl Wood-Counsel to the Board

**Chair** Leahy introduced the commissioners and staff. He stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the land use articles but because there were no public hearing items, he waived administering the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

### C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was none.

### D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### 1. February 25, 2021 Meeting Minutes

**Vice Chair** Collins moved approval of the February 25, 2021 meeting minutes as amended. Dr. Scott seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

#### 2. March 9, 2021 Meeting Minutes

**Vice Chair** Collins moved approval of the March 9, 2021 meeting minutes as written. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

### E. NEW VIOLATIONS AND STATUS OF ACTIVE VIOLATIONS

Ms. Laynor reported that the sign violation at 57 West Street was resolved with an application.

### F. CONSENT DOCKET

#### 1. 196 Duke of Gloucester Street – Gary Schwerzler/Fourth Street Design Studio, Inc. – Restore, repair, and reconstruct the exterior structure due to fire damage. Construct new side entrance. Install new mechanical and electrical systems. **Approved as condition in the staff report and the applicant agreed to the conditions.**

Ms. Laynor noted that staff is handling this application differently because of the damaging fire that required some improvements and review approval.

**Vice Chair** Collins moved to approve the application for 196 Duke of Gloucester Street on the Consent

Docket. Dr. Scott seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

## **G. OLD BUSINESS**

The HPC addressed the application for 196 Duke of Gloucester Street on the Consent Docket.

## **H. PRE APPLICATION**

**Chair** Leahy reminded those present that this pre application discussion is an informal discussion held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility as well as to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval and nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants. The applicants acknowledged that this is a pre application discussion and nothing discussed would be binding on the applicants or the HPC. The Applicants all acknowledged the statement.

- 1. 60 College Avenue/St. John's College** – Mellon Hall & Francis Scott Key Auditorium – The proposed project includes the rehabilitation of exterior elements as well as some minor adaptive features to address long-term maintenance and programmatic adjustments. Rehabilitation efforts and adaptive features primarily focused on the roof, auditorium stage house, and auditorium lobby.

The applicant acknowledged that this is a pre application and nothing discussed is binding on the HPC or applicant.

Mr. Gregory Hoss, David M. Schwarz Architects, thanked the HPC staff for their help in focusing on the issues that are of importance to move this application forward. He explained that the design team finds it an honor to participate in this project to preserve Mellon Hall. He went over the agenda for the presentation to include Presentation of Mellon Hall History (1956-2021) as well as the location on campus, Overview of the College's Programmatic Adjustments to Mellon Hall, Relevant Standards, Guidelines, Definitions, Resources, and the Presentation of the Three Areas of Study (Southeast Corner, Lobby, Solar Panel Roof).

Mr. Reineking went over the three areas of study that affect the exterior to include the Southeast Corner Lobby, Solar Panel on Roof. Mr. Jim Hall discussed the roof design and noted that there are two proposed solar panels for the roof, specifically either angled or flat. He briefly discuss the visibility impacts of the solar panels.

The Applicant's team responded to questions from staff and the HPC.

Ms. Laynor said the design of the corner has improved and using existing openings is a good idea. She noted that adding doors on the north elevation to the curtain wall and removing the doors on the east side violates guideline D.3. She added that restoring the original door on the north side and adding a door to the 1988 addition does comply with the guidelines.

**Chair** Leahy read the comments from Karen Brown of Historic Annapolis expressing concern that the angled solar panels impacts the view shed from McDowell Hall.

**Chair** Leahy **summarized** that there are three design aspects to this application with the first being on the St. John Street side to include the replacement of the existing noncontributing corrugated wall with the two doors with a curtain wall system as well as two entrance doors. The HPC believes that this is a feasible approach to meet the needs of the applicant. The second component is a replacement curtain wall system without the existing doors and the HPC was split on feasibility so would look for further collaboration from the applicants to present options of either retaining the existing doors or a different treatment to acknowledge their presence. On the north elevation, the idea of penetrating the curtain wall with two new exit doors was not feasible due to guidelines D.3 and D.5. The other door on the east elevation, the HPC was split on the change of this door and the feature is not on a historic component

of the building. The HPC discussed the importance of maintaining the existing muntin profile on the curtain wall so look forward to detail drawings on how the new compliant safety glass can stay close to the existing muntin profile because this feature is character defining in this building. The HPC would like to see details of the exterior terrace and all of the landscaping features in another pre application or in a full application. The Applicant should develop the argument of for or against the issue of laminating film. The third component are solar panels on the roof and neither are feasible. The angle option requires a modification to the rooftop in several places so the HPC believes is not feasible. The flat panel installation needs more development and need to ensure is not visual including from McDowell Hall so the applicant has to come up with a final proposal because it does not comply with guidelines D.3 and D.9. Additional guidelines to consider is C.1, C.2, C.4, C.6, D.1 (SOI #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10), D.3, D.4, D.5, D.6, D.9, D.12, D.13, D.16, D.17, D.28, D.29, and D.30. There needs to be masonry on the exterior.

**2. Market Space – Dan Douglas/Douglas Design Build** – Creation of a Market Square – A shaded, leafy place for gathering and dining.

The applicant acknowledged that this is a pre application and nothing discussed is binding on the HPC or applicant.

Mr. Jody Danek, Applicant, explained that the intent is to better use the Market Square/Space and get ahead of the implementation of the City Dock Action Committee final design. The hope is to keep the area closed so are looking toward a solution to beautify this area.

Mr. Dan Douglas described the proposal to do a curb height deck furnished with planters. The proposal is to build the area using natural traditional materials generously planted to have a garden feel about it. The space will accommodate five restaurants. The construction is modular, panelized, scalable and phaseable. He believes that the proposal is “warm, natural and welcoming.”

Ms. Laynor suggested that the Applicant look at the existing guidelines and would need to consider a post-pandemic temporary resolution from City Council to make the bridge. She noted the design is aesthetically appealing but it needs to meet current guidelines. She suggested an interagency meeting to discuss this new concept.

**Chair** Leahy read an email from Karen Brown, Historic Annapolis, expressing that the concept is premature and suggest that they work with the consortium. He noted that he likes the design but the proposal does not comply with particular guidelines. The remaining HPC concurred.

**Chair** Leahy **summarized** that the HPC discussed issues that the proposal does not comply with the guidelines for outdoor sidewalk café furniture, obscuring historic buildings and landscaping. The design as presented is **not feasible** and the concept of a different design is encouraged. The next step is to get a broader technical committee together with the City to determine feasibility in the street for the short term.

**I. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Chair** Leahy deferred the discussion on the umbrella guidelines to an upcoming meeting.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, **Vice Chair** Collins moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:10pm. Dr. Scott seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

**The next meeting is April 22, 2021 as a virtual meeting.**

Tami Hook, Recorder